DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 710 TM 020 899

AUTHOR Durland, Maryann
TITLE Evaluation Implementation: Association of Louisiana Evaluators.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 93
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators (New Orleans, LA, September 30, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; Administrators; Attendance; Consumer Economics; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Interviews; Observation; Patients; Professional Associations; *Program Evaluation; Qualitative Research; *State Programs; *Summative Evaluation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Association of Louisiana Evaluators; *Louisiana; Service Delivery Assessment

ABSTRACT

Two program evaluations are described to demonstrate two very different methodologies and consumer orientations. The first, a patient satisfaction survey commissioned by a medical center, used surveys as part of a larger continuous multipurpose evaluation process, and the second, the ZooGardens evaluation, was a one-time multimethod evaluation of a small interagency program. In the patient satisfaction survey quarterly reports were reviewed and administrators were interviewed to help develop the surveys. The ZooGardens evaluation, which was requested by the Birmingham (Alabama) Park and Recreation Board, used both quantitative and qualitative methods, drawing on interviews, surveys, observations, document analysis, and daily attendance records. The characteristics that seemed to increase the positive impact of both evaluations and defined them as real and practical include the following: (1) timeliness; (2) responsiveness to client perceived needs; (3) responsiveness to client focus; and (4) flexibility. In both of these evaluations working relationships with program managers have been excellent, a factor contributing to positive impact. Four tables summarize some evaluation findings. (Contains 6 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARYANN DURLAND

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 365 710

ASSOCIATION OF LOUISIANA EVALUATORS

EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION

Maryann Durland
Institute for Social Science Research
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

September 30, 1993
New Orleans, Louisiana

TM020899

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. PATIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

III. ZOOGARDENS EVALUATION

IV. SUMMARY

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

Evaluations come in a variety of sizes, configurations and components from summative to formative in nature and from number crunching to Gubanistic in perspective. Current debates encompass issues such as: do we judge programs and goals or do we just crunch the numbers; and how do we integrate evaluation theory, the politics of change, and the selection of methodology to permit the best evaluation per program. The best usually meaning most understandable and useful to the consumer. However, as these debates rage, when our clients implement evaluation results and recommendations, when our evaluations change, focus, strengthen or even (however remote the possibility!) when they lead to the termination of a program, we have already been working within a very clear framework. One representation of this framework is what Morrell (1992) defines as values. Values that, he feels, tie the diverse field of evaluation into a somewhat cohesive whole. These values form the basis for describing the evaluation implementations in this paper. They are:

1. Research should focus on assessing actions that can have practical consequences in real worlds settings.
2. Research in all phases of its life cycle - from design to reporting of results, should aid decision and policy makers.
3. The political nature of programs have legitimate but not exclusive claims on the conduct of evaluation.

In other words, evaluations need to be practical and real, helpful, and politically responsive and in-tune. The purposes of this session are:

1. describe how clients have implemented the results and the recommendations of two distinctly different evaluations and
2. analyze the evaluations and identify the characteristics that seem to facilitate the utilization of evaluation results and recommendations.

The big question is: what <u>are</u> the characteristics of these three values that lead to understandable and useful evaluations.

The evaluations in this paper represent two very different methodologies and consumer orientations. The first utilizes surveys as part of a larger continuous, multi-purpose evaluation process, and the second is a one time multi-method evaluation of a small interagency program. The methodology for

determining implementation for the Patient Satisfaction Survey was to review the Quarterly Reports, to interview the Director of the Poll and the Research Coordinator of the Medical Center as to the development and use of the survey. The Research Coordinator was also asked specifically how the surveys impact on resources, program planning and program operations. For the Zoogardens evaluation the Recreation Superintendent was interviewed. In addition to a specific review of implementations based on each result and recommendation, interview questions were:

1. How were evaluation results disseminated and to whom?
2. Where in the organization were program decisions made and how were these implemented?
3. What were the criteria for implementing or rejecting a recommendation?
4. What role does the evaluation play in future decision making and program direction?
5. Did the evaluation lead to other changes not addressed within the evaluation?

PATIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

The first evaluation is a Patient Satisfaction Survey commissioned by a large regional Medical Center located in a major university town. The Medical Center is one of the largest employees in the area and has the busiest emergency room in the state. The traditional methodology for this survey, now in its 5th year, has been telephone interviews from a random sample of patients discharged each month. All interviews are conducted by experienced, trained telephone interviewers using a computer assisted telephone (CATI) system. There are four survey sets, one for each area of the Medical Center: Inpatient Services, Outpatient Services, Rehabilation, and Speech and Hearing. Each survey takes about 30 minutes based on what services the patient used. The total number of questions in the Inpatient survey is 285 and in the outpatient 246, though no patient would have all of the questions. Responses

to questions are yes or no; or are ranked responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4) or not applicable (5); or from very poor (1) to excellent (4), depending on the question. An overall grand mean, means, frequencies, and percentages aggregated by quarter are reported for each of the four areas in a Quarterly Report. Also reported this year are the responses to the open ended questions that are included for some questions. Histograms and trend lines by month are also reported with each quarterly report. TABLES 1, and 2 below give a brief example of how collected data are reported in the Quarterly Reports. A separate Quarterly Report is provided for all four areas.

Changes in the survey from year to year have generally originated from three sources:

1. the results of previous questions have generated new questions or sources of interest or concern
2. new trends or environmental concerns have demanded new questions or the elimination of old ones and
3. new departments and areas of the Medical Center have been added to the survey.

During the planning for the 1993 survey, for example, the evaluator was able to increase the use of the survey for the client by:

1. expanding the categories of data collected to include all four areas of the Medical Center for the first time,
2. providing more differentiated data by departments and
3 expanding the open ended questions so that specific concerns could be addressed within each department related to patient satisfaction as part of a new, center wide, Quality Assurance Program.

Quoting Fein, Staff and Kobylenski (1993, p.9) "Productive findings that are used by program planners and managers has always been a major goal for evaluators." They also argue that evaluation is "an exercise in power within a program or organization" (1993 p.9). Quoting, "Because use of results often leads to program change of small or major magnitude, and program

DCH OUTPATIENT SERVICES
AUGUST DISCHARGES, 1993
SCHEDULING

TABLE 1

	DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE		WALK-IN	
	COUNT	PERCENT	COUNT	PERCENT	COUNT	PERCENT	COUNT	PERCENT
ABLE TO SCHEDULE APPOINTMENT	3	1.4%	172	81.5%	31	14.7%	5	2.4%

Q-12 You were able to schedule an appointment for services within a reasonable period of time.

(IF STRONGLY DISAGREE OR DISAGREE) Why do you feel this way?

THEY TOOK TOO LONG TO GET STARTED ON MY THERAPY.
THEY TOOK FOR GRANTED THAT I KNEW TO GO TO THE NEW BUILDING WHEN I DID NOT; THEY SPENT TOO MUCH TIME TRANSFERRING ME AROUND.
THE DATES WERE MIXED SOMEHOW.

TABLE 2

DCH OUTPATIENT SERVICES
AUGUST DISCHARGES, 1993
WHAT SERVICE IMPRESSED YOU MOST FAVORABLY?

ADMISSIONS/REGISTRATION

THE ADMISSION PROCESS
THE ADMISSIONS
THE LOCATION OF ENTRANCE AND EXIT. THE ADMISSIONS STAFF WERE REAL NICE.

CANCER CENTER

THE CANCER CENTER. THEY TREAT YOU LIKE YOU ARE SPECIAL.
THE CANCER CENTER
THE CANCER TREATMENT CENTER. EVERYONE IS VERY CARING AND HELPFUL; NO PROBLEMS.
THE QUALITY OF X-RAYS AND TECHNICIANS AT THE CANCER CENTER

CARDIOLOGY

I REALLY LIKED THE TECHNICIAN WHO DID MY EKG; SHE WAS REALLY FAST.

FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT

THE NEW OUTPATIENT FACILITY MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE EVERYTHING DONE IN ONE AREA INSTEAD OF HAVING TO RUN FROM FLOOR TO FLOOR TO RECEIVE SERVICES.
THE SURROUNDINGS IN ADMISSIONS
THE WHOLE ENVIRONMENT. THE ATMOSPHERE WAS COMFORTABLE; RAN VERY EFFICIENTLY.
THE SURROUNDINGS AND THE PERSONNEL WERE GREAT!
IT WAS NICE AND NEW, I WAS PLEASED WITH EVERYONE.
THE WAITING ROOM AND THE NICENESS OF THE PERSONNEL.
IT IS A VERY NICE FACILITY, THE STAFF WAS FRIENDLY, AND WE WERE ABLE TO GET IN AND OUT QUICKLY.
THE NEW FACILITIES WERE GREAT.
THE FACILITY IS NEW AND CLEAN.
PLEASANT SURROUNDINGS AND PROMPTNESS
THE LOCATION OF ENTRANCE AND EXIT. THE ADMISSIONS STAFF WERE REAL NICE.
THE EXCELLENT FACILITIES
I WAS IMPRESSED WITH THE FACILITIES; IT WAS QUIET AND RELAXING.
THE ATMOSPHERE WAS PLEASANT.
THE BUILDING IS NICE; IT MAKES YOU FEEL GOOD.
THE NEW PART; THEY WERE VERY PROMPT.

change in an organization is an exercise in power, the fullest understanding of utilization of evaluation findings must consider how change is effected and how evaluation is related to power" (1993 p.10). This "power" or what I prefer to call "client empowerment" results from evaluations that are: Practical and real; Helpful; and Politically responsive and in-tune.

Evaluations can effect: 1. policy, 2. program planning and implementation and 3. program operations. This is clearly seen in the Medical Center's use of responses to the open ended questions - the "literals".

These "literals" are reported back to the Medical Center's monthly and are used as the basis for staff development and program improvement within each unit. The procedure at the Medical Center is to disseminate the pertinent section of the report to each of the members of a unit and to discuss the results in a staff meeting. As an example of how the Medical Center utilizes the results, housekeeping has complained for several years that weekend staffing is a problem but they could not get approval for additional personnel until they were able to take the data provided which clearly indicated that patients noticed housekeeping was not performed on weekends. With the data for three months, housekeeping submitted a proposal to the administration and received a per diem for weekend housekeeping.

Additionally, the Medical Center is able to take the data they collect on patient charts which clocks the actual time patients wait for services, or spend in the emergency room and then, with the poll data, they can compare the actual versus the patient perceived waiting time. The emergency room has established a Patient Satisfaction Task Force to address this and other concerns related to patient satisfaction.

When the Out Patient Center was opened there were complaints about the parking so within the next survey questions were added that specifically addressed the parking issue and lead to how the parking for this center was developed and implemented.

The Research Coordinator specifically mentioned that because the surveys are center wide, each department gets an unbiased, consistent report. Since

May of 1993 until this past week she had completed almost 70 presentations to departments and units for staff development and Quality Improvement. With Health Reform already in the process, the center is already able to respond to inquiries from insurance companies about charges and the length of patient stays, and if there are other issues that this center is addressing that is in the development stages elsewhere. The results from the Quarterly Reports also go into the center's Annual Reports and other internal research projects.

Zoogardens Summary

The ZooGardens Evaluation was conducted at the request of the Recreation Division of the Birmingham Park and Recreation Board and was a formative evaluation of the ZooGardens Project, which has been a unique, cooperative undertaking of three entities: the Recreation Division of the Birmingham Park and Recreation Board, the Birmingham Zoological Society, and the Birmingham Botanical Gardens.

ZooGardens originated in 1988 with the Recreation Division and the Zoological Society and was designed to provide an environmental awareness project for city children between the ages of 8 and 10. In 1989 the Botanical Gardens joined the venture. The summer of 1991 was the fourth year for the project which continued to target children 8-10 years old who participated in three days of special activities, games, and tours at the Zoo and at the Botanical Gardens.

Children have been enrolled for this project primarily though participation in summer camps held at the 17 city recreation centers under the Recreation Division (see TABLE 3 for a summary of project staff). The major expenses have been: transportation to and from Lane Zoo, which has been supplied by the Recreation Division; materials and supplies for crafts, which have been provided by each division; and a Zoological Society staff person, who has been paid by the Zoological Society.

TABLE 3[1]
PROJECT STAFF

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART		
RECREATION DIVISION * Recreation Superintendent (1) * Recreation Supervisors (2) * Secretary (1) * Recreation Center Directors(17) * Recreation Center Leaders (17)	BOTANICAL GARDENS * Director of Education (1) + Junior League Volunteers (6)	ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY * Volunteer Coordinator (1) * Assistant Summer Volunteer Coordinator (1) * Zoocamp Coordinator (1) + Team Counselors (21) + Teacher Helper (1)

[1] * paid staff
+ volunteer staff

The goals of ZooGardens have been twofold:

* first, to provide a low cost environmental and ecological awareness program for Birmingham city children through the Birmingham Park and Recreation Board recreation centers and

* second, to retain and increase the population attending this and other Zoo and Botanical Garden activities.

This evaluation focused on measuring the extent to which the project goals have been attained and specific objectives have been accomplished. The evaluation questions which resulted from the project goals and objectives are:

1. Has the project succeeded in developing and implementing a low cost environmental awareness project for the targeted population?
2. What has been the actual cost of this project? and
3. Has this project been able to increase attendance and reduce dropouts?

This evaluation utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods. Five major sources of data were utilized: interviews, surveys, observations, document analysis and daily attendance records.

Results

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. There are strong theoretical and empirical foundations supporting the goals and objectives of this project, the curriculum focus and content, and the implementation process and procedures.
2. There is a need to involve recreation center directors more in the program development and implementation processes; this involvement would lead to better enrollment procedures and is necessary for the continued support from the recreation centers.
3. Implementation across both programs is consistent with the project's philosophy and goals.

PROGRAM EFFECT

1. There are indications that the project has an effect on the children based on: repeat attendance, positive attitude, high interest levels, lack of misbehavior problems, and the children's use of novel verbiage.[2]
2. Though not specifically addressed in this evaluation, there are indications that children explore other Zoo and Botanical Garden activities as a result of attending ZooGardens
3. There is a strong affirmation for and affiliation with the project from all levels of participants.

PROJECT COST

---

[2]Novel verbiage is verbiage that has not been introduced into conversation by the interviewer and reflects part of what that child knows, both the word and the meaning.

1. The project has an average total cost of $20.36 per child.

ATTENDANCE

1. There are problems with attendance and these problems result from the enrollment process.
   A. Current attendance is at about 73% of recommended attendance and better enrollment procedures would increase attendance.
   B. The average attendance across weeks is inconsistent.
2. Dropout during the program is not a primary problem, though there are some children who attend for only one or two days.
3. Younger and older children are still a concern, but not as critically as in the past.

Recommendations

There are three categories of recommendations that resulted from this evaluation, the first pertain to the need to sophisticate and organize the enrollment and recruitment process; the second category concerns program suggestions and the third category of recommendations outline possible future evaluations focusing on outcome measure of children' attitudes utilizing a more quantitative approach.

CATEGORY ONE: Enrollment and Recruitment

1. Pre-register for ZooGardens

2. Involve Zoo and Botanical Gardens more in enrollment process

Although it is physically easier for volunteers to keep track of only 3-4 children in a group, and the children get a great deal of individualized attention in such small groups, there would be little lost in quality, in individualized attention, or in group size with more children attending the sessions. Center directors often mentioned that one of the things they liked best about the project was the small groups which allowed for the individualized attention. However, the maximum capacity of between 30 to 40 children a day was based on the capacity of the bus used for transportation and with this maximum in mind, each location, the Zoo and the Botanical Gardens, designed their programs and delivery systems to meet this capacity. There have been sufficient teen counselors and Botanical Garden volunteers to maintain the small groups that the centers find valuable for the children, but these volunteers have not been utilized to the fullest potential because of

the less than maximum enrollments. Although increasing enrollment is a concern, of even greater concern is the inconsistent enrollment.

Personnel are available, such as the Zoocamp Coordinator and the Botanical Garden volunteers, who could help to coordinate the recruitment process by meeting with the centers in May and/or June to help pre-register children for this program. These people might take on a role such as helping with the promotion of the project, as a contact with the centers to make sure children are pre-registered, or with helping to train the directors and leaders better about the project so they can be more involved in the activities with the children both before and after ZooGardens. It would be difficult for these ZooGardens staff members to be primarily involved with the registration of ZooGardens as the Junior League Volunteers are usually not available until May at the earliest and the Zoocamp Coordinator does not begin working with ZooGardens until school is out, during the first week in June. However, they have been identified by project managers as one resource that is available and that could be utilized in the enrollment process.

3. Engage use of center directors who have a strong commitment to this project to help coordinate enrollment procedures on the centers end

As with any other program offered through the centers, directors have the responsibility to function "as a public relations agent for the Birmingham Park and Recreation Board in his center's community. This involves contacting civic clubs, P.T.A.s, and other interested groups about the Center programs....".[3] The directors, however, have incorporated ZooGardens into their summer camp program as a regularly scheduled field trip. This has both benefits and drawbacks. The benefits are that children are available and are organized for this activity. The drawbacks are several: kids are left behind because they are the incorrect age to participate; children in families are separated; directors need to substitute an equivalent activity for the other

[3]Birmingham Park and Recreation Board. (1988). Recreation Center Handbook. page 17.

children and often cannot do this because of the lack of transportation; and sometimes directors need to restructure personnel use to provide supervision for ZooGardens children and the remaining children at the center.

It is not feasible to centralize or even tightly coordinate the ZooGardens enrollment process because of the distance between centers and because of the lack of technical and electronic management systems which would be necessary to coordinate or centralize enrollment. However, there are several directors, who because of their strong commitment to this program, might be interested in exploring how the centers are scheduled to attend, alternatives to grouping the centers for a more consistent enrollment, and who might have ideas on increasing enrollment and who would have valuable input into improving the process.

4. Rearrange time for ZooGardens to better follow pattern of children attending the centers.

Many children attend the centers when they do because of the concurrence of a summer lunch program and the summer camps offered at the centers. This concern was addressed during the presentation of the ZooGardens Evaluation Final Report. ZooGardens is tentatively scheduled to begin one week earlier next summer, and will not have a break during the week of July 4th as the holiday will not affect the day of camp. This will make the schedule coincide with the pattern of attendance at the centers for maximum possible enrollments.

CATEGORY TWO: Program development and Implementation

Other issues that were identified were the distraction of younger or older children who had been inappropriately included in the group, or who tended to follow the zoo campers while not actually joining in the activities. This did not occur as consistently as in past years, but was a problem on some days. During the 1991 session there were children as young as two years old and as old as 12 years old who were brought by the centers. More efficient enrollment should help this situation. Other suggestions made through

interviews throughout the evaluation are:

1. Offer a separate one day program for younger children, which would adapt ZooGardens specifically for ages 4-7 (or other identified ages).

2. Give the children awards or certificates on the last day for their participation in ZooGardens. This would be something tangible that the child could take back indicating the nature of the program.

3. In order to better prepare the children for the ZooGardens experience and to provide for follow-up, it was suggested that there be a pre/and or post visit to the center to reinforce the concepts. This would provide for an extended use of the children's notebooks and a way to extend the learning experience. This would be a way to also involve the directors more in the ZooGardens process. Activities, such as grow labs, are available which could be completed at the centers and which would reinforce the projects goals and objectives.

4. The education coordinators have continued to develop activities and games, as a part of the continuing development of ZooGardens as evidenced by the planned addition on Alabama Indians at the Botanical Gardens for next year and the addition of the Outdoor Learning Centers at the Zoo this year. This is important because children do repeat the program and even though they repeat because they liked what was already available, the additions will help to keep their continued interest and provide new information.

Category Three: Suggestions for future Evaluations

The one major area that needs to be evaluated more closely is the outcome of the program on the children attending this program. Initial indications are that the children do learn from this project and their involvement with it, but a key indicator would be a quantitative measure. There are tests that have been developed that are specifically environmentally oriented. However they are generally far to broad in scope to apply to this project or they are to narrow in topic. What would be appropriate would be a measure based on the content of this project specifically. This would be difficult as some flexibility in content coverage is a part of the natural design of this project. However several techniques could be applied to this project in the development of a measure that could provide a better indication of program effect.

The first would be to develop a list of the critical vocabulary that are emphasized in this project, such as transpiration, ecology, habitat. Pictures could be used to define each word and a 10 - 20 item vocabulary matching test could be developed.

In addition to vocabulary, the concept of prior knowledge could be

applied in the development of a test instrument. For example, children could be asked to draw specific situations, scenes, or animals in their appropriate habitat. A situation might be "can you show me how _____occurs", or "draw you favorite animal", or "draw an animal that lives in the desert". etc. One or two drawings per child could be evaluated by a measure of the amount of detail or accuracy. The same questions would be used for a post test to obtain a measure of change.

IMPLEMENTATION

The process for improving the implementation of Zoogarden's results and recommendations included:

1. Consistent confirmatory interviews throughout the data collection process
2. Oral presentation of preliminary findings with opportunity for discussion and input from the project supervisors
3. A focus on the critical change points identified through the data collection and analysis and supported by both one and two above.

One particular point addressed in the evaluation, was the need to involve the center directors better. The Supervisor said that once the center directors were involved, they understood the project better. Supervisors went over the objectives with the directors during the planning stages, and though they had in the past attempted to tell the directors the objectives, the directors had not understand the program and were very critical of it. With increased understanding and with a sense of ownership, the directors' criticism had diminished significantly. The center directors were involved with the planning from the beginning and had a much stronger interest in the program. The Zoo and the Botanical Garden staffs also attended the staff meetings for the center directors and were able to get a better perspective of their concerns and problems. This lead to a stronger relationship[p between the two and a much stronger, coordinated program for the children. They will continue to do this each year.

Other examples are included in the TABLE 4 which lists each recommendation and comments for each of the two following years.

TABLE 4
ZOOGARDENS SUMMARY 1992-93

RECOMMENDATIONS	1992	1993
CATEGORY ONE: ENROLLMENT AND RECRUITMENT		
1. PRE-REGISTER FOR ZOOGARDENS	Tried to do this, with some success.	Worked out well this year. Lead to more enthusiasm on the part of the kids. They will continue to do this.
2. INVOLVE ZOO AND BOTANICAL GARDENS MORE IN ENROLLMENT PROCESS	Talked about and planned, but did not implement.	Worked very well, the staff went to the centers to prepare the kids for the Zoo and the Botanical Gardens. Everyone loved it.
3. ENGAGE USE OF CENTER DIRECTORIES WHO HAVE A STRONG COMMITMENT TO THIS PROJECT TO HELP COORDINATE ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES ON THE CENTERS END	Could not coordinate it this year; centralized enrolment is not feasible because of the layout of centers and it is not appropriate here.	Directors were involved from the beginning in the planning and it made all the difference in the world. They will continue this with new directors added each year, while still retaining some of the old ones on the planning committee.
4. REARRANGE TIME FOR ZOOGARDENS TO BETTER FOLLOW PATTERN OF CHILDREN ATTENDING THE CENTERS	Implemented at end of program during the summer of 1991. One week was eliminated and centers were combined for a better enrollment number.	Followed the same schedule as 1992, with great improvement in enrollment management.
CATEGORY TWO: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION		
1. ELIMINATE OR ACCOMMODATE YOUNGER CHILDREN A. SEPARATE PROGRAM B. AWARDS C. PRE/POST VISITS TO CENTERS D. CONTINUED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	They tried to do this by eliminating younger children, but the center directors were very vocal about the need to accommodate younger children in the 1993 meeting.	The programs are being adapted for younger children; they are less rigid and it has worked very well this year. Both the Zoo and the Botanical Gardens have developed new programs or parts of program each year. The pre visits to the center have been a key to the continued development of this program. One important point was the addition of a very supportive person to do the program for the Zoo. Though they have not given awards or certificates, they have not ruled this out. Other things are given to the children at this time, such as things they make.
CATEGORY THREE: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE EVALUATIONS		
1. PROGRAM EVALUATION	They feel that an evaluation every 4-5 years would be great. It takes time to change people and to get people on board to do this [illegible] of a program and by the third year they are almost ready to see what else they need to work on. They would specifically like to look at the environmental aspects of the program and what the children are learning.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The characteristics that seem to increase the positive impact of evaluation results and define our evaluations as practical and real, helpful and politically responsive and in-tune are: timeliness (a great standard for assessing evaluations), responsiveness to client perceived needs, responsive to client focus, and flexibility. Evaluations are useful if they meet the client where they are and help them identify what they want and need.

Sanders (1993), though addressing the use of evaluations in foundations, hit the nail on the head for hundreds of other businesses, institutions, agencies, boards, etc. who also want programs to meet specific needs and reach specified goals, when he says..."evaluations must be useful and feasible in addition to being as accurate as they can be." (1993 p.38). One of his suggestions is to work with program managers throughout the entire process, the study design, the progress, the program findings. Throughout both of these evaluations, with working relationships of differing degrees of formality, this has clearly been a strong point. Each evaluation is different, but unquestionably these characteristics seem to increase the positive impact of evaluation results and recommendations by helping clients make decisions about policy, resources, program planning and operations. One interesting note, change takes time, and it is accomplished one step at a time and sometimes one program's steps may be bigger than another's, but it is the process of change and improvement that is critical.

What more can we ask for?

****

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:
Special thanks to Dr. Debra McCallum at The Capstone Poll, Institute for Social Science Research, University of Alabama, for providing illustrative examples of Poll results for use throughout this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fein, E. , Staff, I., & Kobylenski S. (1993). The evaluator as power merchant. Evaluation Practice. 14(1). 9-16. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Leonard, E. C. Jr., & Miller, M. J. (1992). The role of evaluation in increasing the usefulness of employee involvement programs. Evaluation Practice. 13(1). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Morell, J.A. (1992). Industrial productivity: New perspectives for a traditionally trained evaluator. Evaluation Practice. 13(2).125-134. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Sanders, J. R. (1992). Evaluations in foundations, comments. Evaluation Practice. 13(1). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Weiss, C. H. (1993). Where politics and evaluation research meet. Evaluation Practice. 14(1). 93-106. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Weiss, C. H. (1993). Politics and evaluation: a reprise with mellower overtones. Evaluation Practice. 14(1). 107-109. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.